

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 7, 14, and 17 were pending in this application. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 14, and 17, and have added new claims 31-42. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 17, and 31-42 will be pending upon entry of this Amendment.

In the final Office Action mailed June 19, 2008, claims 1, 6, 7, 14, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0097322 to Monroe et al. (“Monroe”). To the extent that the rejection might still be applied to the currently pending claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In this Amendment, each of independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 17 has been similarly amended to recite a feature of the present invention that is neither taught nor suggested by Monroe. Claim 1, for example, recites an information exchange method wherein access of a terminal device to information gathering devices is not permitted if a table sent from the terminal device is not the same as a previously registered table (claim 1: “wherein when the link destination setting table sent from the terminal device is not the same as the previously registered link destination setting table, linking to an information gathering device associated with the requested entry is not permitted”).

Accordingly, the inventive method acts to prevent terminal devices from gaining access to information gathering devices based upon a comparison of a link destination setting table sent from the terminal device and one that is registered with a server or information gathering device. Figure 12 of the specification provides an example of a link destination setting table that includes

a set of rows corresponding to different channels. Each channel in each row corresponds to a different link destination URL that can be the source of information. Thus, the link destination setting data table comprises a data structure having a specific set of correspondences between each of a plurality of channels and each of a plurality of destinations.

As disclosed in the present specification, for example, at page 16, line 28 to page 17, line 12, when a terminal user wants to access a particular channel specified in a link destination setting table and the user sends a request for the channel, if the specific table sent with the channel request by the terminal device is not previously registered, the present invention acts to prevent linking to the requested channel. Thus, in accordance with the present invention, the particular table sent by a requesting terminal must be determined to be previously registered to grant a terminal device access to a channel.

Monroe, while disclosing a system that allows a display to access multiple different cameras, fails to disclose several aspects of the features recited in amended claims 1, 7, 14, and 17, as discussed above.

In the first place, Monroe does not disclose that a requesting terminal sends a link destination setting table to a server or information gathering device, as recited in the present claims. Paragraph [0088] is cited by the Examiner as teaching aspects of a link destination setting table. While paragraph [0088] discloses that a camera ID and name are stored in a table, the table is not a link destination setting table, that is, the table of Monroe does not contain a set of channels together with corresponding destinations. Even if this table were considered to be a link destination setting table, there is no mention in Monroe that this table is sent from a terminal to a server or information gathering device.

Secondly, since Monroe fails to disclose sending a link destination setting table from a terminal device to a server or information gathering device, Monroe cannot logically disclose the recited aspect of the invention, wherein when the link destination setting table *sent* from the terminal device is not the same as the previously registered link destination setting table, linking to an information gathering device associated with the requested entry is not permitted. The portions of Monroe cited by the Examiner teach that after a user logs into the system, the user is provided with "the entire user interface" to access all the different cameras of the system (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0087]-[0088]). The user merely uses a mouse to navigate and gain access to a particular camera (paragraph [0090]: "If the icon is double clicked, then the camera's video appears."). Nowhere does Monroe hint that a table is sent to a server by the user, or compared to a registered table to prevent access to the camera if the sent table is not a previously registered table. In fact, Monroe fails to disclose preventing access to the information gathering devices at all.

For at least the above reasons, Monroe fails to teach or suggest the complete combination of features recited in each of the independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 17, as well as dependent claim 6. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 6, 7, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 31-42 have been added herein to recite further aspects of the invention. In particular, the twelve newly added claims comprise four substantially similar sets of dependent claims, wherein each set recites a dependence from one of the four independent claims 1, 7, 14, and 17. Support for the newly added claims can be found, for example, at page 16, lines 9-15 and page 17, lines 15-16 of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that,

Serial No.: 10/511,631

Attorney's Docket No.: SUZ0017-US

Art Unit: 2145

Page 14

Inventor : Takatoshi NAKAMURA et al.

for at least the above reasons as apply to their respective independent claims, as well as the additional features recited in each dependent claim, all of the newly added claims are patentable over Monroe.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

875 15th Street, N.W.


Washington, D.C. 20005

Tel: 202/551-1700

Date: October 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

MB/SPA/RR/ggb
Customer No. 36183